

REMARKS

Claims 10-30 are pending in the application with the present amendments, including new claims 22-30. In the Office Action, claims 10-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,058,563 to Chrysanthakopoulos ("*Chrysanthakopoulos*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,588 to Shapiro et al. ("*Shapiro*"). For the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are fully distinguished from the combination of *Chrysanthakopoulos* and *Shapiro*.

In the Office Action, the examiner relied on *Shapiro* as teaching the feature of the electronic device of claim 10 of selecting one of a plurality of separately selectable functions for installation of driver data in the selected main equipment to permit the selected function to be executed using the electronic device while the electronic device is mounted to the selected main equipment.

Amended claim 10 now recites that the electronic device has an output unit which is operable when a first function is selected from among a plurality of separately selectable functions to output a first portion of the software data which contains driver data for the selected first function and corresponding to the selected specific computer operating environment. When a second function is selected from among the plurality of separately selectable functions, the output unit is operable to output a second portion of the software data which contains driver data for the selected second function and corresponding to the selected specific computer operating environment. Summarizing, the electronic device contains software driver data corresponding to a plurality of separately selectable functions and specific computer environments and is operable to output the portion of the software driver data that

corresponds to the selected function and specific computer operating environment. Depending which function is selected, a different portion of the software driver data is output to the main equipment.

*Shapiro* does not teach an electronic device which contains portions of software driver data corresponding to separately selectable functions. Rather, *Shapiro* describes a system in which each "additional peripheral 170" has a dedicated function (col. 4, lns. 47-59), which can be for example, a CD-ROM drive, a printer, a scanner, or modem, etc. While the additional peripheral includes a memory device 220 and a storage device emulation subsystem 230, the operation of these devices are necessary to the function of the peripheral function subsystem 210 (FIG. 2). There is no selection of a function from among a plurality of separately selectable functions. And while *Shapiro*, col. 4, ln. 63 through col. 5, ln. 15 describes storage of related application and utility programs on the memory device, *Shapiro* does not disclose the storage of different portions of software driver data on the additional peripheral device corresponding to separately selectable functions, where such portions can be output to the main equipment upon selection of the separately selectable function for installation and execution of the selected function.

Claims 13 and 16 are amended herein to recite similar features and are believed to be distinguished from the combination of *Chrysanthakopoulos* and *Shapiro* for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Moreover, applicant further submits that the combination of cited references does not teach the features recited in with respect to claims 22 through 27. The cited references do not teach an electronic device containing software

driver data for a plurality of separately selectable functions including a network interface, e.g., an Ethernet interface, for providing connection between the main equipment and an external computer network.

Referring to claims 28-30, applicant respectfully submits that the combination of cited references does not teach an electronic device having an exterior housing (FIG. 2) having a shape similar to that of a memory card with at least generally flat top and bottom major surfaces separated by a thickness of the electronic device, the dimensions of the top and the bottom major surfaces being substantially greater than the thickness, where the housing contains the data memory unit, with spaced apart features at an end of the housing interleaved with contacts.

Rather, *Chrysanthakopoulos* and *Shapiro* merely describe systems which connect to a computer using a serial bus such as Universal Serial Bus ("USB") or IEEE 1394. Neither teaches the exterior housing and memory card-like shape of an electronic device now recited in claims 28-30. Typical USB and IEEE 1394 connectors do not exhibit the recited features of the electronic device.

Support for the present amendments is provided, inter alia in paragraphs [0027], [0031], [0046] and [0047] and FIG. 2.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.


Application No.: 09/925,234

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-196

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Daryl K. Neff  
Registration No.: 38,253  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

746641\_1.DOC